REMARKS

The present application was filed on May 22, 2000 with claims 1-31. Claims 1-31 remain pending. Claims 1, 8, 13, 15, 22, 27 and 29-31 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action dated October 3, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,867,799 to Lang et al. (hereinafter "Lang").

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lang, Applicants assert that such claims are patentable for at least the reasons that independent claims 1, 8, 13, 15, 22, 27 and 29-31, from which claims 2-7, 9-12, 14, 16-21, 23-26 and 28 depend, are patentable.

Independent claims 1, 15 and 29 of the present invention recite techniques for recognizing one or more end-user transactions, which originate at a client workstation, from one or more remote procedure calls. The remote procedure calls are obtained, and the end-user transactions from the remote procedure calls are recognized based on training data associated with remote procedure calls. At least a portion of the results that are associated with the end-user transaction recognition operation are stored in a memory.

Lang discloses a system for filtering a massive flow of information entities to meet user information classification needs. A data stream from a computer network contains raw information relevant to the user embedded therein. The raw information is adaptively filtered in response to a dynamic characterization producing information, which is proposed to the user. A feedback profile is received from the user, responsive to the proposed information. The feedback is used to adapt the content profiles and collaboration profiles, which are then used to update the dynamic characterization.

Lang fails to disclose the recognition of end-user transactions from remote procedure calls based on training data associated with remote procedure calls. Lang filters information that may be desired by a user and then presents that filtered information to the user for feedback. Probabilistic techniques of Lang consider the probability that the filtered information satisfies the users informational need. This differs from the claimed invention in that the claimed invention recognizes

an end-user transaction from remote procedure calls based on training data associated with remote procedure calls. Lang is silent as to any such recognition involving end-user transactions and remote procedure calls.

Independent claims 8, 22 and 30 of the present invention recite techniques for generating a model for recognizing end-user transactions from remote procedure calls received at a server from a workstation. Remote procedure calls labeled with end-user transactions are obtained, and selected features are computed from these remote procedure calls. The model is constructed from the selected features.

Lang does not disclose the generation of a model for recognizing user transactions from remote procedure calls, as in the claimed invention. Lang also fails to disclose the computation of selected features from remote procedure calls labeled with end-user transactions, as in the claimed invention. Finally, Lang fails to disclose the construction of a model from these selected features, as in the claimed invention.

Independent claims 13, 27 and 31 of the present invention recite techniques for automatically generating training data used to construct a model for use in recognizing end-user transactions from remote procedure calls received at a server from a workstation. A client workstation marks the beginning and end of user transactions which are correlated with remote procedure calls to generate remote procedure calls labeled with end-user transactions. These labeled remote procedure calls serve as training data.

Lang fails to disclose the automatic generation of training data for constructing a model for use in recognizing end-user transactions, as in the claimed invention. Further, Lang also fails to disclose the marking of the beginning and end of user transactions and correlating with remote procedure calls to generate labeled remote procedure calls, as in the claimed invention.

In addition, Applicants submit that claims 2-7, 9-12, 14, 16-21, 23-26 and 28 are patentable over the cited reference not only due to their respective dependence on claims 1, 8, 13, 15, 22 and 27, but also because such claims recite patentable subject matter in their own right.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2004

Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547